

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,742	06/24/2003		Richard A. Haase	CV-29	8168
45922	7590	04/06/2006		EXAMINER	
		(INVENTOR)	PHASGE, ARUN S		
4402 RINGROSE DRIVE MISSOURI CITY, TX 77459				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			·	1753	1753

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Cu

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
0.55	10/602,742	HAASE, RICHARD A.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Arun S. Phasge	1753					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nety filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	-· action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction		, ,					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	•	d in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	` ''						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)					
	<del></del>						

### DETAILED ACTION

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eng in view of Boughton of record for reasons of record.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eng in view of Boughton as applied to claims above, and further in view of Narayanan of record for reasons of record.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation within the references to combine the Eng and Boughton patents.

The examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 U.S.P.Q. 607. However, there is no requirement that a motivation to

make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Simon*, 174 U.S.P.Q. 114; *In re McLaughlin*, 170 U.S.P.Q. 209. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, 163 U.S.P.Q. 545.

All that is required to show obviousness is that the applicant "make his claimed invention merely by applying knowledge clearly present in the prior art. Section 103 requires us to presume full knowledge by the inventor of the prior art in the field of his endeavor." *In re Winslow*, 151 U.S.P.Q. 48 CCPA (1966).

The Eng patent discloses the electrolytic production of hydrogen peroxide as claimed. The reference does not disclose the purification of the produced hydrogen peroxide by a membrane process. The Boughton reference was cited to teach the purification of hydrogen peroxide to obtain high purity peroxide by the use of a membrane, said membrane can be selected to separate a variety of different contaminants (see col. 2, line 38 to col. 5, line 27).

Consequently, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Eng patent with the teachings of the Boughton patent, because

the Boughton patent teaches the use of membranes to obtain high purity hydrogen peroxide.

Accordingly, the claims stand rejected.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1753

(571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aruk S. Phasge

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1753